

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the above-captioned patent application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

By the foregoing amendment, claims 1 and 5 have been amended. Thus, claims 1-19 are currently pending in the application and subject to examination.

In the Office Action dated March 24, 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 3, 5, 17 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Van Asma (U.S. Patent No. 6,897,902 B1) in view of Knox et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,351,292 B1, hereinafter "Knox"). The Examiner also rejected claims 4 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Van Asma in view of Knox, and further in view of Shibamiya et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,926,174, hereinafter "Shibamiya"). In addition, the Examiner rejected claims 6, 7 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Van Asma in view of Knox, and further in view of Suga et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,215,674, hereinafter "Suga"). Moreover, the Examiner rejected claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Van Asma in view of Knox, and further in view of Shibamiya, and further in view of Suga. The Examiner also rejected claims 10, 11 and 12-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Van Asma in view of Knox, and further in view of Cooper (U.S. Patent No. 5,489,947). It is noted that claims 1, 5 and 17 have been amended. To the extent that the rejections remain applicable to the claims currently pending, the Applicant hereby traverses these rejections, as follows.

In claim 1, as amended, the control section includes a data expansion control section capable of selectively increasing a data amount of only the second image data group read from said image memory, according to the second image data group.

Thus, in the Applicant's invention as recited in amended claim 1, the second image data group may be selectively expanded. The Applicant submits that Van Asma neither discloses nor suggests selective expansion of the second image data group only. Rather, Van Asma discloses scaling the video data and the OSD data equally.

Moreover, the Applicant submits that none of the applied art of record, nor combination thereof, discloses or suggests at least the combination of a display buffer memory for storing the first image and the second image read from said image memory, in a format to be displayed on a display screen; and a control section for controlling accesses in said image memory and said display buffer memory, for reading the first image data group from the first memory area and writing the first image data group in said display buffer memory, and for reading the second image data group from the second memory area and writing the second image data group in a specified area of said display buffer memory, wherein said control section includes a data expansion control section capable of selectively increasing a data amount of only the second image data group read from said image memory, according to the second image data group, as recited in claim 1, as amended.

For at least this reason, the Applicant submits that claim 1, as amended, is allowable over the applied art of record. As claim 1 is allowable, the Applicant submits that claims 2-16, which depend from allowable claim 1, are allowable for the same reasons as claim 17, as well as for the additional subject matter recited therein.

Similarly to as discussed above with respect to claim 1, the Applicant submits that none of the applied art of record, nor combination thereof, discloses or suggests at least the combination of storing, in an image memory, a first image data group for a background and a second image data group for an on-screen display; reading the first image data group for a background and the second image data group for an on-screen display from the image memory and selectively increasing a data amount of only the second image data group; and displaying, on a display screen, the first image data group and a second image data group of which the data amount is increased, as recited in claim 17, as amended.

For at least this reason, the Applicant submits that claim 17, as amended, is allowable over the applied art of record. As claim 17 is allowable, the Applicant submits that claims 18-19, which depend from allowable claim 17, are allowable for the same reasons as claim 17, as well as for the additional subject matter recited therein.

CONCLUSION

The Applicant respectfully submits that the above-captioned patent application is in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that an in-person or telephonic interview with the Applicant's representatives would expedite the prosecution of the above-captioned patent application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney of records. The Applicant believes that no fees are due as a result of this response. Nevertheless, in the event of any variance between the fees determined by the Applicant and those determined by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, please charge any such variance to the undersigned's Deposit Account No. 01-2300, referencing attorney docket number 107317-00030.

Respectfully submitted,



Wilburn L. Chesser
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 41,668

Customer No. 004372
ARENT FOX, PLLC
1050 Connecticut Ave., N.W., Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339
Telephone No. (202) 715-8434
Facsimile No. (202) 638-4810

WLC:ksm